

REMARKS

Information Disclosure Statement

We are resubmitting an IDS for the references to the “wolfram” and “latex-project” websites with a fuller description of the information being submitted, including screen shot printouts of both the reference websites containing date and time stamps (Central Standard time) indicating when the content was printed.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4-5, 8, 16-18, 32-33, 35, 39, 40-41, 48, 50, 61, and 63 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alcorn et al. (US 2004/0153509) and Roschelle et al. (US 6,628,918). Claims 6, 7, 10-12, 14, 37, 38, 43-45, and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alcorn et al. in view of Roschelle et al. and further in view of Bell et al (US 2004/0126745).

Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10-12, 14, 16-18, 32-33, 35, 37-41, 43-45, 47-48, and 50

In discussing Applicant’s independent claims 1 and 32, the Examiner refers to the Alcorn prior art and states that “[t]he creation of multiple-choice questions inherently includes entering a question description... and the possible answer options to the questions (amended claims 1 and 32), receiving a response from the students and comparing the response with one or more answers is shown in paragraphs 173 and 223.” Applicants however, respectfully submit that neither Alcorn nor the other cited prior art references disclose the limitation of the specific format of the answers provided by the teacher and specific format of the student responses, or the manner in which answers provided by the teacher and student responses are created.

Independent Claims 1 and 32 include claim limitations in which each teacher computer implements a teacher equation editor application that comprises one or more program instructions for performing the steps of receiving a question (from a teacher via the input device), storing the question, and “receiving one or more answers corresponding to the question description via the input device, wherein each answer includes one or more of an equation and an expression.” None of the prior art references cited by the Examiner teach that the received answers corresponding to the question descriptions include “one or more of an equation and an expression.” Additionally, because the answers include “one or more of an equation and an

expression”, the student responses must also include one or more of an equation and an expression. This limitation is also not taught by the prior art references.

Furthermore, upon a careful reading of Applicant’s specification, it is clear that the subsequent claim limitation in claims 1 and 32 of “receiving a response from one of the plurality of student computers” contemplates embodiments in which students use a student equation editor to create, from scratch, responses that have an *equation and an expression* in order to respond to the aforementioned questions (see at least paragraphs 0022, 0039, and 0040). Applicant’s specification specifically states:

“As shown in FIGs. 4 and 5, students are preferably provided with a question 406 within a frame 404 in an application on the student computer. The question 406 may require the student to respond in the form of a response 415. A response may be in the form of an equation or expression. Equations or expressions may be entered by, for example, selecting one or more symbols from a menu, selecting one or more symbols using buttons in the application, using one or more hot keys, and/or entering information in the character-based syntax. In an embodiment, all symbols, variables, and operations may be presented to the user simultaneously as a palette of buttons.” (See paragraph 0040).

In contrast, a complete reading of Alcorn shows that it only discloses that the teacher may use an equation editor in creating content to be taught to students, not that the students can use an equation editor to respond to the questions asked by the teacher. Alcorn further does not disclose that the students respond to questions by using the equation editor to either key in mathematical text or select mathematical symbols in order to create equations and expressions as responses to the teacher’s questions, as in the present invention. Because neither Alcorn nor the remaining prior art references disclose each and every limitation of independent claims 1 and 32, claims 1 and 32 are not obvious under 35 USC §103. Accordingly, the rejection of independent claims 1 and 32, as well as the rejection of the remaining claims which depend there from, should be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Claims 61 and 63

In discussing Applicant’s independent claim 61, the Examiner refers to the Alcorn prior art and states that “Instructions for transmitting the question description to the student computers (claim 8, 41, and 61) is shown in paragraphs 173 and 223.” Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner’s reading of the teachings of the prior art. Alcorn at paragraphs 173 and 223 teaches only that quizzes and surveys are stored in folders that are accessible to both students and

teachers. It does not, however teach that the teacher's computer system has program instructions for transmitting the question description directly to each student computer via the communications network. As can be seen upon careful reading of the Applicant's specification, the teacher's equation editor includes program instructions that allows the teacher to create, in real time while teaching, an equation to be solved by the students and transmit the question description directly to each student computer. The Applicant's equation editor does not place the questions into a folder to be accessed by the student only when he is ready to view it or has selected a specific folder as is the case in Alcorn. Because neither Alcorn nor the remaining prior art references disclose each and every limitation of independent claim 61, claims 61 is not obvious under 35 USC §103. Accordingly, the rejection of independent claim 61, as well as the rejection of the remaining claims which depend there from, should be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds for rejection have been accommodated or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. There being no other rejections, Applicants respectfully request that the current application be allowed and passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

/Lawrence S. Pope/

Lawrence S. Pope
Registration No. 26,791

CUSTOMER NUMBER 26565
MAYER, BROWN, ROWE & MAW LLP
P.O. Box 2828
Chicago, IL 60690-2828
Telephone: (312) 701-8286
Facsimile: (312) 706-9000